METHODOLOGICAL CRISES AND THE PATH TO RIGOR IN ANOMALISTIC AND PARAPSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Methodological Crises and the Path to Rigor in Anomalistic and Parapsychological Research

Dakota Frandsen

Copyright © 2026 by Dakota Frandsen
All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.
First Printing, 2026

Methodological Crises and the Path to Rigor in Anomalistic and Parapsychological Research

The scientific investigation into extraordinary human experiences and alleged psychic phenomena occupies a highly contentious and historically fractured position on the periphery of mainstream scientific inquiry. The persistence of this pursuit over more than a century reflects a profound human curiosity regarding the limits of consciousness, the nature of time, and the boundaries of physical reality. However, the field dedicated to authenticating these phenomena—parapsychology—has perpetually struggled to achieve legitimacy within the broader scientific community. This enduring struggle is not necessarily rooted in an inherent scientific bias against the extraordinary, but rather in a pervasive history of systemic methodological flaws, an inability to produce independently replicable empirical results, and a theoretical framework that frequently contradicts established, foundational principles of physics and neuroscience.[1]

To foster genuine scientific work rather than entertainment or spectacle, it is necessary to rigorously examine the methodological fault lines that have historically compromised paranormal research. Modern scientific paradigms require a comprehensive understanding of the replication crisis in psychology, the statistical illusions that generate false-positive anomalies, the cognitive mechanisms that simulate supernatural experiences, and the structural reforms—such as study preregistration and adversarial collab-

oration—that are absolutely essential for returning rigor to the study of the unexplained. The path forward demands a fundamental epistemological shift: moving away from the desperate search for evidence of the impossible, and toward the rigorous, naturalistic study of why the human mind experiences the extraordinary.

The Historical and Epistemological Context of Fringe Science

The origins of formal parapsychological research can be traced back to the late nineteenth century, a period characterized by profound shifts in the understanding of the natural world. The rapid advancement of Darwinian evolutionary theory and modern physics presented a formidable challenge to deeply entrenched religious and spiritual beliefs concerning human exceptionalism, mind-body dualism, and post-mortem survival.[1] As supernaturalism in its many forms—deities, discarnate spirits, and magic—was gradually expunged from academic discourse, a deep epistemological anxiety emerged among scholars who sought a middle ground between religious orthodoxy and the increasingly materialistic, soulless worldview offered by empirical science.[1]

The Society for Psychical Research (SPR) was founded in this era with the explicit goal of utilizing the newly formalized scientific method to validate the existence of the human soul and psychic phenomena.[1] During this time, mainstream physics was undergoing a revolution with the discovery of previously undetected, invisible energies such as Roentgen's

X-rays, Hertz's radio waves, and Becquerel's radioactivity.[1] To early psychical researchers, it seemed entirely plausible that undiscovered natural energies could similarly account for telepathy, clairvoyance, psychokinesis, and mediumistic communication.[1]

However, while mainstream scientific disciplines such as physics, biology, chemistry, and eventually psychology integrated into a cohesive, cumulative framework of natural laws, the study of the paranormal remained fundamentally estranged from this consensus.[1] Over the subsequent 150 years, normal science demonstrated compounding progress: theoretical constructs were refined, measurement procedures were perfected, and empirical effect sizes grew stronger as methodologies improved. In stark contrast, parapsychology failed to produce any consistent pattern of research findings or a single, unified theory.[1] The emotionally compelling, seemingly paranormal personal experiences that initially drove the field were eventually replaced by monotonous laboratory guessing tasks, with success determined solely by minuscule statistical deviations from chance expectation.[1] When experimental methodologies, such as Zener card guessing or random event generator tests, were ultimately abandoned as inadequate due to the discovery of sensory leakage or methodological artifacts, new methodologies would emerge every decade promising a breakthrough, only to inevitably prove just as futile.[1]

This historical trajectory strongly supports the critique that parapsychology operates less as an objective scientific discipline and more as a "belief in search of evidence".[1] It represents an enduring remnant of the historical breakup

between science and supernaturalism, characterized by a persistent effort to demonstrate that the mind can act independently of the brain.[3] To reform the study of these phenomena, the scientific community must first address the foundational errors in how these phenomena are defined and categorized.

Delineating Boundaries: Parapsychology Versus Anomalistic Psychology

To critically evaluate the modern research landscape and prevent the degradation of science into spectacle, a strict demarcation must be established between two parallel but diametrically opposed disciplines: parapsychology and anomalistic psychology.[4] While both fields examine extraordinary human experiences that deviate from everyday expectations—such as telepathy, precognition, clairvoyance, out-of-body experiences, and apparitions—their foundational assumptions, theoretical frameworks, and methodological approaches are entirely different.[4]

Parapsychology is predicated on the hypothesis that the conventional physical and biological sciences are fundamentally incomplete, and that human consciousness possesses undiscovered capabilities that transcend known boundaries of space, time, and physical force.[2] The discipline seeks to prove the objective existence of extrasensory perception (ESP)—the acquisition of information without the use of known sensory channels—and psychokinesis (PK)—the physical influence of matter by the mind without the involvement of recognized motor organs.[6] Parapsychological

research relies heavily on controlled laboratory experiments, utilizing tools like random number generators, Ganzfeld sensory deprivation states, and remote viewing protocols, with the ultimate goal of isolating statistical anomalies that defy chance.[2] The theoretical orientation of the field often posits the existence of unknown forces or dimensions, occasionally attempting to retroactively apply complex, misunderstood principles of quantum mechanics to justify macroscopic psychic phenomena.[4]

In sharp contrast, anomalistic psychology operates strictly within the boundaries of established neuroscientific, cognitive, and psychological frameworks.[4] It does not assume the existence of supernatural forces or undiscovered psychic energies. Rather, anomalistic psychology investigates the subjective nature of anomalous experiences, seeking to explain *why* individuals genuinely perceive and interpret certain events as paranormal.[5] This discipline attributes anomalous experiences to a complex array of naturalistic variables, including cognitive biases, perceptual errors, memory distortions, psychological trauma, sleep anomalies (such as sleep paralysis and hypnagogic hallucinations), suggestibility, and environmental factors.[5]

Anomalistic psychology recognizes that even if an experience can be fully explained by conventional psychological mechanisms, the experience itself remains profoundly real and emotionally significant to the individual who felt it.[5] Fear, emotion, and the cognitive power of the human mind are demonstrably real, and the way humans construct their perception of reality is incredibly complex.[5] By utilizing qualitative research, psychophysiological measurements,

and neuroimaging, anomalistic psychology provides a rigorous bridge between the extraordinary and the everyday workings of the human mind, earning a stronger academic foundation and broader acceptance within mainstream research institutions than parapsychology.[4]

Feature	Parapsychology	
Core Objective	To prove the objective reality of anomalous forces (e.g., ESP, PK) that transcend physical laws.	m tic m
Theoretical Framework	Postulates new dimensions, quantum mind theories, or undiscovered physical energies.	sc en og
Methodological Focus	Controlled laboratory experiments (Ganzfeld, random event generators) aiming for statistical anomalies.	ro ch
Scientific Reception	Highly controversial; widely criticized as pseudoscience due to methodological flaws and non-replicability.	su ps en

Fostering genuine scientific work requires prioritizing the framework of anomalistic psychology. When researchers immediately assume an experience is supernat-

ural, they abandon the rigorous scientific tools available for understanding human cognition.[5] Understanding how deeply the human brain itself can shape, alter, and construct a seemingly paranormal reality is a far more robust and empirically verifiable pursuit than searching for undetectable psychic forces.[5]

Pervasive Methodological and Theoretical Flaws in Parapsychology

The primary criticism leveled against parapsychological research by the mainstream scientific community is not merely theoretical or ideological, but deeply methodological. Decades of critical reviews, meta-analyses, and independent audits have identified persistent structural weaknesses that routinely generate spurious evidence for paranormal claims.[1] The philosopher and psychologist James Alcock has provided some of the most comprehensive critiques of these methodological failures, arguing that the evidential status of parapsychology remains entirely unconfirmed due to a severe lack of experimental rigor.[1]

THE FALLACY OF THE NEGATIVE DEFINITION

A defining characteristic of established natural sciences is that phenomena are positively defined; researchers understand the properties, constraints, and mechanisms of the entities they are measuring. Parapsychological phenomena, however, are almost exclusively defined by negation.[1] "Psi" is claimed to exist only when all known normal explana-

tions—including chance, sensory leakage, cognitive inference, and methodological artifacts—have supposedly been ruled out.[1]

This negative definition creates a profound epistemological vulnerability. It is logically and practically impossible to guarantee that every single normal explanation or hidden methodological shortcoming has been identified and successfully eliminated from an experiment.[1] When an experiment yields a statistically significant deviation from chance expectation, parapsychologists frequently interpret this unexplained variance as affirmative, definitive proof of psychic ability.[1] However, statistical significance is entirely silent as to its cause; it merely indicates an anomaly in the data distribution under the parameters of the null hypothesis.[1] Equating an unexplained statistical variance with telepathy, precognition, or divine intervention is an unjustified inferential leap.[1] In numerous high-profile cases, subsequent independent reviews of "successful" parapsychological studies have demonstrated that the observed anomaly was entirely the result of subtle experimental artifacts, such as flaws in randomization procedures, data handling errors, or sensory cueing.[9]

THE ABSENCE OF LIMITS, BOUNDARIES, AND COHERENT THEORY

Another devastating critique of parapsychology is that alleged paranormal forces lack any defined physical boundaries or constraints. Parapsychological literature frequently claims that psychic influences are pervasive, unstoppable, and limitless.[1] According to proponents, no physical means

has ever been found to block or shield against telepathy or psychokinesis.[1] These forces are claimed to operate just as strongly across tens of thousands of miles as they do across a single room, unaffected by physical barriers, and are even claimed to operate retroactively backward in time.[1] In classical physics, all known fundamental forces—such as gravity and electromagnetism—are subject to the inverse-square law, weakening proportionally over distance. A phenomenon that is completely immune to situational context, physical barriers, and the arrow of time behaves suspiciously like a methodological artifact or a statistical error rather than a genuine physical force.[1]

Furthermore, parapsychology suffers from a severe lack of theoretical maturity. For decades, the discipline has been satisfied with testing weak theories that predict, at best, only the direction of an effect rather than making precise, mathematically sound predictions about the size or specific mechanism of the effect.[1] To compensate for this theoretical void, researchers often retroactively borrow concepts from complex theoretical physics—such as quantum entanglement, non-locality, and the Heisenberg uncertainty principle—to justify macroscopic psychic phenomena.[1] Mainstream physicists consistently reject these appropriations, noting that quantum effects apply strictly to subatomic particles in highly controlled, isolated states, and do not scale up to complex, warm, wet biological systems like the human brain.[1] The attempt to map quantum mechanics onto human psychology without empirical justification is a prime example of pseudoscience, acting as a smokescreen for the field's lack of an indigenous explanatory model.[1]

THE ILLUSION OF THE "PSI EXPERIMENTER EFFECT" AND REPLICABILITY

A cornerstone of the scientific method is independent, external replication; a genuine physical or psychological effect should be reliably reproducible by any competent researcher following the documented protocol.[12] Parapsychology has notoriously failed to produce a single phenomenon that can be independently replicated by neutral or skeptical scientists.[1]

To excuse this persistent failure, the field has invented ad-hoc rationalizations, most notably the "psi experimenter effect".[8] This highly controversial hypothesis suggests that the skepticism, negative attitude, or lack of belief of an independent researcher actively disrupts or blocks the physical manifestation of the paranormal phenomenon.[1] This effect was famously explored in collaborative studies between skeptical psychologist Richard Wiseman and proponent Marilyn Schlitz on the remote detection of staring.[13] In these joint studies, utilizing the exact same experimental protocol and participant pool, the proponent (Schlitz) reliably achieved statistically significant results suggesting psychic detection, while the skeptic (Wiseman) consistently obtained completely null results.[13]

While parapsychologists argue this divergence proves that psi is a delicate phenomenon sensitive to the psychological state of the observer, skeptics and methodologists argue it is far more likely indicative of subtle, undocumented methodological differences, unconscious sensory cueing, or differing data handling practices that bias the outcome.[14] A discipline that asserts its phenomena physically evaporate in

the presence of skeptical observation or rigorous methodological controls effectively insulates itself from falsifiability.[1] If failure to replicate is classified as evidence of the phenomenon's sensitivity rather than evidence of its nonexistence, the discipline steps outside the bounds of empirical science and enters the realm of unfalsifiable dogma.[8]

THE VULNERABILITY TO FRAUD AND POST HOC RATIONALIZATION

The lack of stringent controls and the reliance on subjective interpretation make parapsychology uniquely vulnerable to experimenter fraud. James Alcock has pointed out that standard scientific procedures for handling fraud—namely, post hoc investigations—are ineffective in parapsychology because signs of data manipulation can easily be attributed to psychic interference.[7] For instance, in the infamous Levy case, compelling evidence of fraud required direct, covert detection of the experimenter physically manipulating the data during an ongoing trial.[7] To foster genuine scientific work, parapsychological experimental procedures must be designed to make fraud by any single experimenter virtually impossible, a standard that was advocated for but largely abandoned in recent decades.[7] The failure to implement these prophylactic measures, combined with a total reliance on negative definitions, ensures that parapsychology remains plagued by methodological doubt.[8]

The Psychology of the Spectacle: Evidential Mediumship and Cognitive Biases

To understand how the illusion of the paranormal is constructed and maintained in the absence of genuine anomalous forces, one must examine the practice of evidential mediumship. The core empirical claim of evidential mediumship is that specific, verifiable information regarding deceased individuals is obtained by the medium beyond the limits of chance or prior knowledge.[15] The investigation of mediums provides a clear, exhaustive case study of how the experience of the paranormal is actively generated through ordinary cognitive, psychological, and linguistic mechanisms.

Modern neurobiological approaches to studying mediums in an altered state (often referred to as a trance) have yielded data entirely consistent with psychological explanations. Neuroimaging studies, such as the SPECT scan work conducted by Andrew Newberg, have demonstrated that when mediums perform readings, there is a measurable decrease in neural engagement, specifically in parietal-lobe regions associated with self-referential processing, spatial boundaries, and autobiographical memory retrieval.[15] This localized deactivation correlates perfectly with the phenomenological claim made by mediums that they experience a loss of self-boundary and feel as though "it isn't me speaking".[15] However, while the scans accurately map the neurological *state* of procedural offloading or an altered state of consciousness, they provide absolutely no evidence regarding ontology.[15] The scans show no signal that could not be produced entirely by the medium's own brain; there is

no transmission, no reception, and no external discarnate source detectable by the imaging equipment.[15]

When subjected to rigorous statistical analysis and tightly controlled laboratory protocols, the claims of evidential mediumship rapidly deteriorate. Early laboratory studies in the late 1990s often reported strong hit rates, but these studies were heavily criticized by skeptics for insufficient blinding.[15] In these early designs, sitters provided live feedback during the readings, allowing mediums to observe subtle physical reactions and micro-expressions.[15] As protocols tightened to prevent this sensory leakage—such as the implementation of the quintuple-blind Windbridge protocol, where sitters and mediums never interact, the discarnate is only named, and readings are scored by proxies against decoy transcripts—effect sizes plummeted.[15] Independent, high-powered replications by research teams, including Chris French at Goldsmiths University and Richard Wiseman, have consistently returned null results once all vectors for ordinary information gathering and cold reading are hermetically sealed.[15]

The illusion of a highly accurate, specific psychic reading is generated entirely through well-documented psychological and linguistic mechanisms, which skeptical literature has exhaustively cataloged. These mechanisms are not necessarily accusations of conscious fraud, but rather an inventory of how the human mind naturally produces the profound experience of a genuine reading [15]:

Cognitive / Linguistic Mechanism	Description an umship
Cold Reading	The practice of f guesses calibrated in cues, including micr regional accent, and or wedding rings).[15]
Warm Reading (The Barnum Effect)	The delivery of l that statistically app man population, bu deeply and uniquely on your knee" or "T feels overlooked"). sive and stable acros
Hot Reading	The unethical, c client. Modern prac obituaries, and exte gather specific facts gins.[15]
Rainbow Ruse	Delivering enco ments (e.g., "You ar deeply require solitu ful "hit" regardless o logical or personalit

Confirmation Bias	The cognitive te remember the succe completely ignoring of "misses." Post-ho show that objective around 20–30%, des an 80% success rate.
Subjective Validation	The sitter, deepl desire to make mean fit vague, ambiguou context of their own the primary engine fect.[15]

These mechanisms demonstrate that the human mind, driven by emotional vulnerability, acts as the primary architect of the psychic experience. The medium merely provides an ambiguous, highly structured framework, and the sitter's own cognitive biases construct the paranormal event.[15] True scientific inquiry into these practices does not require validating the paranormal; it requires understanding the profound psychological forces that make subjective validation so compelling.

The Catalyst of Crisis: Daryl Bem and the Retrocausation Paradigm

The methodological fault lines of parapsychology violently collided with mainstream psychology in 2011, trigger-

ing what is now widely recognized as the replication crisis across the behavioral and social sciences.[16] The catalyst for this scientific upheaval was the publication of an article titled "Feeling the Future: Experimental Evidence for Anomalous Retroactive Influences on Cognition and Affect" by the highly respected social psychologist Daryl Bem in the prestigious *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (JPSP).[18]

Bem's paper reported the results of nine separate experiments involving over 1,000 university participants, explicitly testing for precognition (conscious cognitive awareness of the future) and premonition (affective apprehension of the future).[20] Bem theorized that well-established, canonical psychological phenomena—such as the mere exposure effect, habituation, and the facilitation of recall—could operate backward in time, representing an anomalous retroactive influence of future events on an individual's current responses.[18]

In a classic facilitation of recall experiment, participants practice a list of words and are subsequently tested on their memory, with the expectation that practice improves recall. Bem radically reversed this temporal sequence: participants were given a memory recall test first, and *afterward*, a computer randomly selected a subset of those words for the participants to practice.[18] Bem reported the astonishing finding that participants were significantly more likely to recall the specific words they were destined to practice in the future, suggesting an anomalous retroactive transfer of information.[18] In another variation testing precognitive approach to erotic stimuli, participants had to guess which of two

curtains hidden on a computer screen concealed an erotic photograph; Bem reported that participants guessed correctly at a rate slightly, but statistically significantly, above the 50% chance baseline.[20] Across all nine experiments, Bem reported a mean effect size () of 0.22, with eight of the nine experiments yielding statistically significant results.[20] Furthermore, he noted that the individual-difference variable of "stimulus seeking" (a component of extraversion) significantly correlated with higher psi performance.[20]

The publication of this paper forced the global scientific community into a severe epistemological dilemma.[17] Bem's study design, randomization procedures, and statistical analyses appeared, on the surface, to adhere strictly to the accepted methodological standards of contemporary social psychology.[17] Therefore, scientists were faced with an excruciating choice: either accept the empirical data and concede that the fundamental laws of linear time, thermodynamics, and causality were incorrect, or reject the data, which necessitated admitting that the standard methodological and statistical practices used across all of psychology and behavioral science were fundamentally flawed and capable of producing impossible results.[17]

The scientific response was immediate and overwhelmingly critical. Independent researchers urgently attempted to replicate Bem's findings. Large-scale, high-powered replication efforts led by independent teams, including Stuart Ritchie, Richard Wiseman, and Chris French, failed entirely to observe any precognitive or retroactive effects.[11] Despite the rigor of these failed replications, the saga revealed a deeply ingrained publication bias within main-

stream science: traditional peer-reviewed journals were highly reluctant to publish negative or null findings, forcing researchers to turn to open-access platforms like PLoS ONE to disseminate their results and correct the scientific record.[23]

A deeper, post-hoc analysis of Bem's original data and methodology revealed catastrophic structural weaknesses that, disturbingly, were considered standard practice at the time. Critics, including James Alcock, pointed out that the experiments suffered from highly fluid methodologies—often referred to metaphorically as "dirty test tubes".[8] These flaws included changing experimental procedures partway through trials, combining the results of tests with varying probabilities of significance, utilizing arbitrary rules for data exclusion, and failing to define specific criteria before the experiments began.[8] This practice—retroactively altering the parameters of an experiment, running multiple uncorrected statistical tests, and selectively reporting only the configurations that yield a statistically significant pattern in the noise—became widely known as "p-hacking" or Questionable Research Practices (QRPs).[12]

Bem's paper ultimately did not prove the existence of precognition; rather, it inadvertently proved that the standard statistical hygiene of the behavioral sciences was so deeply impoverished that it could be weaponized to mathematically "prove" the impossible.[10] This profound realization cascaded far beyond the borders of parapsychology, leading to systemic, field-wide reexaminations of classic studies in psychology, neuroscience, and medicine.[16] The replication crisis exposed that famous experiments, such

as John Bargh's 1996 study on unconscious social priming (where participants supposedly walked slower after being primed with words related to old age), suffered from the exact same methodological vulnerabilities as Bem's precognition studies, and frequently failed to replicate under strict conditions.[25]

The Statistical Illusion: Frequentist Failures and the Bayesian Alternative

The fallout from the Bem affair and the broader replication crisis highlighted a critical structural flaw in how science evaluates extraordinary claims: the overreliance on Null Hypothesis Significance Testing (NHST) and the strict adherence to arbitrary -values ().[10] Parapsychological research is particularly vulnerable to the systemic weaknesses of frequentist statistics due to the minuscule effect sizes it attempts to isolate from massive datasets.[1]

LOW STATISTICAL POWER AND THE INFLATION OF EFFECT SIZES

A primary driver of non-replicability across the natural and social sciences is low statistical power.[16] Statistical power refers to the probability that a test will correctly reject a false null hypothesis (i.e., detect a true effect). Studies analyzing the psychological literature estimate that the average statistical power of psychology studies is incredibly low, ranging between 33.1% and 36.4%, far below the 80% threshold considered adequate.[16] Neuroscience fares even worse, with estimated median power around 21%.[16]

When an original study is conducted with low power (typically characterized by a small sample size attempting to detect a very weak or non-existent effect), it creates a dangerous statistical environment.[12] First, low-power replications have a reduced ability to detect true effects. Second, and most critically for parapsychology, if a low-power study *does* manage to achieve a statistically significant result, that result is mathematically highly likely to be either a complete false positive (Type I error) or a grossly exaggerated estimate of the true effect size.[12] If a purported parapsychological effect is practically zero, testing it across thousands of trials with loose, undefined parameters guarantees that random noise will eventually cross the threshold of statistical significance. When subsequent, high-powered, properly controlled and preregistered replication attempts are launched, the effect inevitably regresses to the mean and disappears completely.[15]

This phenomenon is closely related to the "sharpshooter fallacy"—a methodological failure where the researcher essentially fires a bullet at a barn door and only afterward draws a target around the bullet hole.[24] By engaging in optional stopping (repeatedly analyzing data as it comes in without correcting the alpha level) or Hypothesizing After the Results are Known (HARKing), researchers introduce severe systematic bias.[24] The methodological procedure used is entirely incapable of revealing that the shooter was actually a bad shot; the claim might be presented as true, but it has not been severely or transparently tested.[24]

THE BAYESIAN ALTERNATIVE AND PRIOR PROBABILITY

In response to the absurdities generated by standard frequentist approaches to anomalous claims, methodologists such as Eric-Jan Wagenmakers heavily criticized Bem's findings and advocated for the widespread adoption of Bayesian statistics.[21] Bayesian inference represents a fundamental philosophical and mathematical shift from frequentist approaches. Instead of treating probabilities as binary frequencies of repeated events, Bayesianism treats probabilities as continuous degrees of mental credence, updating subjective uncertainty as new evidence is introduced.[28]

Crucially, Bayesian analysis incorporates *prior knowledge* (priors) and assesses the relative probability of different models given the observed data using Bayes factors.[19] When evaluating extraordinary claims—such as the retroactive reversal of time, the existence of telepathy, or the cold fusion of atoms—the prior probability of the hypothesis is infinitesimally low, given the massive, accumulated success of classical physics and thermodynamics over centuries.[21] Bayesian analysis requires that extraordinary claims be supported by correspondingly extraordinary evidence; a marginal -value of 0.04 is insufficient to overturn the laws of physics.

Furthermore, Bayes factors inherently penalize highly complex, vague models that can retroactively predict almost any outcome—a common feature of parapsychological theories that rely on negative definitions and invisible forces—in favor of simpler, more restrictive models, such as

the null hypothesis.[28] While computing posterior distributions using techniques like Gibbs sampling can be computationally expensive and conceptually difficult compared to simple point estimates, it is absolutely essential for rigorous truth-seeking in fringe science.[28] Re-analyses of historical parapsychological data sets—including Bem's precognition data—using stringent Bayesian frameworks frequently demonstrate that the data actually strongly supports the null hypothesis over the existence of an anomaly, effectively collapsing the statistical illusion upon which the field relies.[21]

Ethical Guidelines and the Rejection of Pseudoscientific Spectacle

If the study of anomalistic psychology and the investigation of the unexplained is to definitively separate itself from pseudoscience and entertainment, researchers must adhere strictly to modern ethical guidelines and technological transparency. The rapid globalization of "ghost hunting" media, reality television, and pseudo-documentaries has severely degraded the public's understanding of scientific inquiry, replacing empirical rigor with dramatized, highly fabricated spectacle.[29]

TECHNOLOGICAL TRANSPARENCY AND THE MISUSE OF EQUIPMENT

A critical requirement for fostering genuine scientific work is the appropriate, documented, and transparent use of environmental sensors and technology. Fringe experimental tools, such as modified sweeping radios ("ghost

boxes"), AI-driven voice analyzers, and psionic amplifiers, possess absolutely no documented scientific or investigatory merit.[29] These devices are specifically designed to exploit *pareidolia*—the deeply ingrained human cognitive tendency to perceive meaningful auditory or visual patterns in random noise.[8]

When deploying these tools, amateur investigators and media personalities routinely conflate highly subjective interpretations (e.g., "we felt a presence here") with measurable, empirical phenomena (e.g., a documented 10-degree temperature drop).[29] Rigorous ethical standards require that unverified, entertainment-based tools be explicitly labeled as exploratory, and that any results generated by them be firmly sequestered from empirical data sets.[29] Furthermore, with the rapid integration of artificial intelligence into research, any use of machine learning for pattern recognition, visual editing, or audio transcription must be completely transparent. Researchers must account for algorithmic biases and software hallucinations, actively preventing AI-generated artifacts from being misconstrued or intentionally presented as paranormal evidence.[29]

ETHICAL DATA COLLECTION AND VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

The pursuit of the anomalous frequently intersects with individuals experiencing profound grief, acute psychological distress, trauma, or cognitive decline. Ethical investigation demands strict adherence to informed consent protocols, especially when collecting audio, visual, or envi-

ronmental data in private residences, religious institutions, or sacred spaces.[29]

Surveillance-style data collection, such as the use of hidden cameras or unauthorized live streams, fundamentally violates ethical norms and invalidates the research.[29] Prioritizing the mental health, privacy, and safety of human subjects over the acquisition of alleged "evidence" ensures that investigations do not exploit vulnerable populations for the sake of entertainment or financial gain.[29] Furthermore, researchers must actively prohibit provocative, challenging, or dramatic behavior designed to generate a media spectacle—such as yelling at unseen entities or staging reactions—as this completely contaminates the psychological and physical environment, nullifying any claim to objective scientific observation.[29]

The Open Science Imperative: Preregistration, Registered Reports, and Adversarial Collaboration

The ultimate requirement for fostering genuine scientific work in the realm of the anomalous is the full, unreserved adoption of the stringent mechanisms of the Open Science movement. The primary antidote to the methodological flexibility, -hacking, optional stopping, and publication bias that have historically plagued both parapsychology and mainstream psychology is the mandatory implementation of study preregistration and Registered Reports.[24]

THE MECHANICS OF PREREGISTRATION AND REGISTERED REPORTS

Preregistration requires researchers to publicly archive a comprehensive, time-stamped, and unalterable research plan before a single piece of data is collected.[24] This plan must meticulously detail the exact hypotheses, the experimental design, sample size power calculations, rules for data exclusion, and the precise statistical analysis pathways that will be utilized.[24] By explicitly defining these parameters in advance, researchers are entirely stripped of the opportunity to opportunistically manipulate data post-hoc or to selectively report only the experimental trials that yielded significance.[24]

An even more robust iteration of this concept is the Registered Report model, sometimes referred to as reviewed preregistration.[31] In this format, the complete research protocol is submitted directly to a peer-reviewed journal *prior* to data collection.[31] If the methodology is deemed highly rigorous and the research question theoretically sound by peer reviewers, the journal grants an "in-principle acceptance".[32] This vital mechanism guarantees publication regardless of whether the final results support the researcher's hypothesis or return a completely null finding.[32] This process perfectly aligns scientific values and incentives, removing the systemic pressure on authors to produce beautiful, sensational, or significant stories in favor of producing highly accurate, methodologically flawless data.[32]

THE IMPACT OF PREREGISTRATION: THE KOESTLER PARAPSYCHOLOGY UNIT REGISTRY

Interestingly, parapsychology holds a unique, albeit largely unrecognized, place in the history of open science initiatives. Decades before mainstream psychology began widely adopting study registries, the *European Journal of Parapsychology* (EJP) implemented a prototype registration scheme that operated between 1976 and 1992.[30] A retrospective analysis of this early prototype demonstrated its massive impact: only 8.4% of the registered reports yielded significant findings, compared to a highly suspicious 28.4% success rate for non-registered reports published during the same period.[30]

In 2012, directly in the wake of the Bem replication crisis, researchers Jim Kennedy and Caroline Watt established the Koestler Parapsychology Unit's Study Registry (KPU SR).[30] This platform remains parapsychology's only active, managed study registry. Unlike many self-directed registries used in mainstream psychology (where researchers simply upload a document without oversight), the KPU SR enforces exceptionally rigorous standards: it requires authors to explicitly declare whether a study is exploratory or confirmatory, demands detailed boundaries for statistical testing (e.g., specifying one-sided versus two-sided tests), actively peer-reviews and revises almost every submission prior to acceptance, and permanently restricts editing access once an investigation is underway.[30]

The empirical data yielded from this registry provides the clearest, most undeniable indictment of historical parapsychological methods. A comprehensive 2026 analysis by

Wiseman and Watt compared the outcomes of confirmatory studies preregistered on the KPU SR (from 2012 to 2025) against all non-preregistered parapsychology studies published in the exact same journals during the same timeframe.[30] The results were stark and deeply revealing:

Study Type (Parapsychological Research)	Rate of Statisti Findings
Non-Preregistered Studies (Standard Publication)	46.6%
Preregistered Studies (KPU SR Managed Registry)	16.0%

Data reflecting comparative analysis by Wiseman & Watt (2026).[30]

This massive reduction in positive findings mirrors identical trends observed when mainstream psychology adopted Registered Reports, wherein positive result rates frequently dropped from over 90% in standard literature to roughly 44% in preregistered tracks.[30] The KPU SR data strongly suggests that the vast majority of historical "evidence" for parapsychological phenomena is not the detection of genuine anomalous forces, but rather the direct mathematical consequence of Questionable Research Practices, optional stopping, and profound publication bias.[24] When researchers are forced to declare their targets before firing the arrow, the illusion of psychic ability rapidly vanishes.[24]

ADVERSARIAL COLLABORATION

Finally, the deep ideological divides that exist between skeptics and proponents of the paranormal can be constructively bridged through the practice of adversarial collaboration—an approach popularized by Nobel laureate Daniel Kahneman.[34] In this framework, research teams with directly opposing theoretical beliefs or hypotheses agree to work together to design a mutually acceptable, highly controlled experimental protocol.[34] They preregister the exact methodology and conduct the data collection and analysis jointly, ensuring that neither side can later claim foul play or hidden methodological artifacts.[34]

While past collaborative attempts, such as the remote staring studies by Wiseman and Schlitz, highlighted the confounding variables of the so-called experimenter effect, modern adversarial collaborations bounded by strict Registered Report parameters offer the most scientifically viable path forward.[14] By pre-agreeing on the specific criteria for falsification and success before any data is gathered, the academic debate successfully shifts from endless post-hoc squabbling over statistical artifacts to a genuine, transparent advancement of psychological knowledge.

Conclusions

The persistent pursuit of anomalous human experiences represents a fascinating, enduring intersection of cognitive science, neurobiology, and psychological vulnerability. However, the century-long attempt to force these profound subjective experiences into an objective, physical ontology

through the framework of parapsychology has largely failed. More than a century of investigation has clearly demonstrated that the "paranormal" retreats proportionally as methodological rigor advances. When experiments are loosely controlled, relying on negative definitions and fluid statistical parameters, anomalies appear to abound; when protocols are tightened, blinded, externally evaluated, and strictly preregistered, the anomalies inevitably dissolve back into statistical noise.

The replication crisis in psychology, precipitated by methodologically flawed studies like Daryl Bem's "Feeling the Future," served as a painful but necessary corrective for the entire scientific enterprise. It revealed that the very statistical methods used to validate the paranormal were the exact same methods corrupting mainstream behavioral science. The path forward demands a complete, uncompromising cessation of spectacle-driven investigation, the abandonment of unfalsifiable theories, and the rejection of negative definitions.

To foster genuine scientific understanding, researchers must pivot definitively toward anomalistic psychology—focusing their resources on the complex, naturalistic mechanisms of the human brain that generate the subjective experience of the extraordinary. For those who insist on continuing to test for objective paranormal forces, absolute adherence to Open Science principles, highly powered statistical designs, Bayesian analytical frameworks, and the mandatory use of Registered Reports are non-negotiable requirements. The integrity of science lies not in the attractiveness or the emotional resonance of the final claim, but

in the unyielding transparency, rigor, and severity of the method used to test it.

Works cited

1. PARAPSYCHOLOGY: THE SEARCH SCIENCE LEFT BEHIND, accessed July 2, 2026, https://pic-pac.cap.ca/index.php/Issues/showpdf/article/v76n1.0-a4115.pdf
2. Parapsychology - Wikipedia, accessed July 2, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parapsychology
3. Your Qubits. - Physics in Canada (PiC), accessed July 2, 2026, https://pic-pac.cap.ca/index.php/Issues/showpdf/issue/v76n1.0.pdf
4. What do you think are the differences between Parapsychology and Anomalous Psychology? | ResearchGate, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/post/What_do_you_think_are_the_differences_between_Parapsychology_and_Anomalous_Psychology
5. The Art of Understanding PARAPSYCHOLOGY & ANOMALISTIC PSYCHOLOGY | by Snigdha G | May, 2026 | Medium, accessed July 2, 2026, https://medium.com/@snigdhagopi8/the-art-of-understanding-parapsychology-anomalistic-psychology-4c826be2b76d
6. Relevance of para-psychology in psychiatric practice - PMC - NIH, accessed July 2, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3056186/
7. Methodological Criticisms of Parapsychology - ResearchGate, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.re-

searchgate.net/publication/344740378_Methodological_Criticisms_of_Parapsychology
8. James Alcock - Wikipedia, accessed July 2, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Alcock
9. Ganzfeld experiment - Wikipedia, accessed July 2, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ganzfeld_experiment
10. Perhaps Psychology's Replication Crisis is a Theoretical Crisis that is Only Masquerading as a Statistical One - Tidsskrift.dk, accessed July 2, 2026, https://tidsskrift.dk/irtp/article/view/127764
11. Feeling the Future Again, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.psy.lmu.de/gp/people/leitung/maier/feeling_the_future_again1.pdf
12. Is Psychology Suffering From a Replication Crisis? - Deborah Apthorp, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.deborahapthorp.com/courses/replicability/topic_8/readings/Maxwell2015.pdf
13. Parapsychology - Richard Wiseman - WordPress.com, accessed July 2, 2026, https://richardwiseman.wordpress.com/research/parapsychology/
14. Of two minds: Sceptic–proponent collaboration within parapsychology - Richard Wiseman, accessed July 2, 2026, http://www.richardwiseman.com/resources/twominds.pdf
15. Reports of Concern, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1cY56tC_ZEnLLiHD98W23mqcYbqoxY-OvqklJbSMi9UDE

16. Replication crisis - Wikipedia, accessed July 2, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Replication_crisis
17. Faith and flaw: The replication crisis is here - Vascular Specialist, accessed July 2, 2026, https://vascularspecialistonline.com/the-replication-crisis-is-here/
18. In Defense of Studying Unserious Things: Precognition | Psychology Today Canada, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.psychologytoday.com/ca/blog/unserious-psychology/202212/in-defense-of-studying-unserious-things-precognition
19. (PDF) BEM's "feeling the future" (2011) five years later: Its impact on scientific literature, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318456873_BEM's_feeling_the_future_2011_five_years_later_Its_impact_on_scientific_literature
20. Feeling the future: experimental evidence for anomalous retroactive influences on cognition and affect - PubMed, accessed July 2, 2026, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21280961/
21. The (Really) Astonishing Hypothesis: Looking into the Future | Psychology Today, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/sense-time/201805/the-really-astonishing-hypothesis-looking-the-future
22. (PDF) Failing the Future: Three Unsuccessful Attempts to Replicate Bem's 'Retroactive Facilitation of Recall' Effect - ResearchGate, accessed July 2, 2026,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/221724589_Failing_the_Future_Three_Unsuccessful_Attempts_to_Replicate_Bem's_'Retroactive_Facilitation_of_Recall'_Effect
23. Precognition studies and the curse of the failed replications | Chris French - The Guardian, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.theguardian.com/science/2012/mar/15/precognition-studies-curse-failed-replications
24. Full article: The benefits of preregistration and Registered Reports - Taylor & Francis, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/2833373X.2024.2376046
25. The Replication Crisis in Psychology - Noba Project, accessed July 2, 2026, https://nobaproject.com/modules/the-replication-crisis-in-psychology
26. (PDF) The Replication Crisis in Psychology: Five Reasons why the Replication Crisis is not Only About Methods - ResearchGate, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/404676228_The_Replication_Crisis_in_Psychology_Five_Reasons_why_the_Replication_Crisis_is_not_Only_About_Methods
27. Feeling the future: A meta-analysis of 90 experiments on the anomalous anticipation of random future events - PMC, accessed July 2, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4706048/
28. What are the most important critiques of Bayesian reasoning? Can you steel man them?, accessed July

2, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/slatestarcodex/comments/w8mmrd/what_are_the_most_important_critiques_of_bayesian/

29. A Code to the Night, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1SgPRMsj3md1k_cjOSpLsD-fAiVgzSxXD_RncTdo2wuxI
30. (PDF) Study preregistration: an early example and analysis, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/405241457_Study_preregistration_an_early_example_and_analysis
31. Pre-registration and registered reports - FORS - Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences, accessed July 2, 2026, https://forscenter.ch/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/heers_fg09_preregistration_v1.1.pdf
32. Registered Reports - Center for Open Science, accessed July 2, 2026, https://www.cos.io/initiatives/registered-reports
33. ponderingtheparanormal.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1cNHKUIwY8QhYFDBEjEytstGvejB-DWL3z
34. Using Adversarial Collaboration Research Theory to Advance Teamwork and Innovation, accessed July 2, 2026, https://fisher.osu.edu/blogs/leadreadtoday/using-adversarial-collaboration-research-theory-advance-teamwork-and-innovation